

REMARKS

Claims 9, 11 and 12 were pending at the time of the Office Action. In this Amendment, claims 9 has been amended to clarify an aspect of the invention and claim 17 has been newly added. Care has been exercised not to introduce new matter. Support is found in, for example, FIGS. 1-3 and corresponding descriptions. Claims 9, 11, 12 and 17 are currently pending for examination, of which claim 9 is independent.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 9 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamaki (2003/0122750 A1, hereinafter “Tamaki”) in view of Suzuki et al. (US 2004/0164301 A1, hereinafter “Suzuki”). Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tamaki, Suzuki et al. in view of Muruyama et al. (US 2004/0061670 A1, hereinafter “Muruyama”). The rejections are respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claim 9, in pertinent part, recites “a plurality of scanning arrangements corresponding to number of the plurality of scanning lines, each of the plurality of scanning arrangements connecting said scanning lines freely to a first potential or a second potential,” “each of said scanning switch arrangements includes a first transistor for connecting said scanning lines to said first potential, and a second transistor for connecting said scanning lines to said second potential,” and “said control arrangement controls said first transistors of scanning switch arrangements, which are not selected for luminesce, to be connected to said first potential.”

As disclosed in FIGS. 1-3, illustrating one example of what is recited in claim 9, the control unit 8 reads the voltage data VGS1 to VGSn from the memory unit 8a in accordance with the numbers 1 to n of the pixels to luminesce on the scanning lines S1 to Sm selected, and

outputs the drive signals based on the voltage data VGS1 to VGSn read, to the transistor Tr2 of the scanning switches 21 to 2m corresponding to the scanning lines S1 to Sm unselected. When the number of pixels to luminesce on the scanning line S2 is n, the drive signals based on the voltage data VGSn are outputted to the transistor Tr2 of the scanning switches 21 and 23 to 2m corresponding to the scanning lines S1 and S3 to Sm unselected. For example, when the number of pixels to luminesce on the scanning line S2 is one, the drive signal based on the voltage data VGS1 is outputted to the transistor Tr2 of the scanning switches 21 and 23 to 2m corresponding to the scanning lines S1 and S3 to Sm unselected. (See paragraphs [0036]-[0043] of the application-as-published)

The proposed combination of Tamaki, Suzuki and Muruyama fails to disclose the limitations of claim 9 regarding “said control arrangement controls said first transistors of scanning switch arrangements, which are not selected for luminesce, to be connected to said first potential.”

Tamaki’s selection of scanning lines COM1-COMn for luminesce does not affect or relate to supply of drive voltages to the transistors 182 and 183-1~183-3 of the negative electrode output circuits 180-1~180-n. The signals inputted to the transistors 183-1~183-3 and the OR gate 181 determines the level of the voltage provided to the scanning line COM1. See paragraph [0032] and FIGS. 1A~1C. In contrast, claim 9 requires “said control arrangement” to “control[s] said first transistors of scanning switch arrangements, which are not selected for luminesce, to be connected to said first potential.”

In addition, Muruyama, which was cited for the temperature detecting means, and Suzuki, which was cited for higher impedance state, are silent on that the cathode side drive circuit 2 has two transistors (first transistor and second transistor).

Accordingly, as each and every limitation must be disclosed or suggested by the cited prior art references in order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness (*see*, M.P.E.P. § 2143.03) and for at least the foregoing reasons the proposed combination of Tamaki, Muruyama and Suzuki fails to do so, it is respectfully submitted claim 12 dependent upon and including all limitations of claim 9 is patentable over the combination of Tamaki and Muruyama.

Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that this application should be allowed and the case passed to issue. If there are any questions regarding this Amendment or the application in general, a telephone call to the undersigned would be appreciated to expedite the prosecution of the application.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP



Hosang Lee
Limited Recognition No. L00,295

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 SAB/HL:cac
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
Date: May 28, 2009

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277
as our correspondence address.**